



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,040	04/07/2000	Gerard M. Col	CNTR:1568	9434

23669 7590 02/09/2004

JAMES W HUFFMAN  
1832 N. CASCADE AVE.  
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80907-7449

EXAMINER

LI, AIMEE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2183

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/545,040

Applicant(s)

COL ET AL.

Examiner

Aimee J Li

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 and 33-34 have been considered. Claims 1, 10, 18, 21, 23, 26, 30, and 34 have been amended as per Applicant's requests. Claim 32 has been cancelled per Applicant's request.

#### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please reword "wherein said plurality of stages of the pipeline subsequent to said first pipeline stage *do not* comprise store buffers" to read -- wherein said plurality of stages of the pipeline subsequent to said first pipeline stage comprise non-store buffers-- or something similar in nature to eliminate any concern regarding a negative claim limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being taught by Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,487,156 (herein referred to as Popescu).

5. Referring to claim 1, Popescu has taught an apparatus within a pipelined microprocessor for forwarding store instruction results to a pipeline stage for execution of a load instruction, the apparatus comprising:

- a. A result forwarding cache (RFC), for storing at least one non-store instruction result destined for a user-visible register of the microprocessor, and for storing a

plurality of store instruction results (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9; column 6, lines 38-49; Figure 1; and Figure 5);

- b. Comparison logic, for comparing a load address of the load instruction with a plurality of store addresses associated with said plurality of store instruction results to generate an address match signal (Popescu column 8, lines 29-36; Figure 1; and Figure 5); and
  - c. Control logic, configured to receive said match signal and selectively forward one of said plurality of store instruction results from said RFC to the pipeline stage in response to said match signal (Popescu column 1, lines 39-45; column 8, lines 35-59; Figure 1; and Figure 5).
6. Referring to claim 2, Popescu has taught wherein said plurality of store instruction results comprise data to be stored from the microprocessor into a memory attached thereto (Popescu column 8, lines 56-59 and Figure 5).
7. Referring to claim 3, Popescu has taught wherein said load address specifies a location of data to be loaded into the microprocessor from a memory attached thereto (Popescu column 8, lines 56-59 and Figure 5). In regards to Popescu, the address is inherent, since the address must be provided in order to return data from the specific address.
8. Referring to claim 4, Popescu has taught wherein said RFC comprises a plurality of storage elements for storing a predetermined number of instruction results (Popescu column 6, lines 38-49 and Figure 1).

Art Unit: 2183

9. Referring to claim 5, Popescu has taught wherein said instruction results are received by said RFC from an execution unit of the microprocessor (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9).

10. Referring to claim 6, Popescu has taught wherein said plurality of storage elements store said predetermined number of instruction results in a first-in-first-out manner (Popescu column 8, lines 29-59 and column 13, lines 67-65).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,487,156 (herein referred to as Popescu) in view *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (herein referred to as *In re Rose*). Popescu has not explicitly taught wherein said predetermined number of instruction results is five. However, Popescu has taught that the number of results that are stored varies (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that the exact size of the buffer or cache does not matter since, no matter how many instruction results are present, the device functions the same. See *In re Rose*.

13. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,487,156 (herein referred to as Popescu) in view Abramson et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,606,670 (herein referred to as Abramson).

14. Referring to claims 8 and 9, Popescu has not taught

- a. Wherein said load address and said plurality of store addresses comprise virtual addresses (Applicant's claim 8) (Abramson column 1, lines 36-52 and column 5, lines 8-13).
- b. Wherein said virtual addresses comprise x86 linear addresses (Applicant's claim 9) (Abramson column 1, lines 36- 52 and column 5, lines 8-13).

15. However, Popescu has taught an out-of-order system with addresses (Popescu column 2, line 47 to column 3, line 9). Abramson has taught an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21)

- a. Wherein said load address and said plurality of store addresses comprise virtual addresses (Applicant's claim 8) (Abramson column 1, lines 36-52 and column 5, lines 8-13).
- b. Wherein said virtual addresses comprise x86 linear addresses (Applicant's claim 9) (Abramson column 1, lines 36- 52 and column 5, lines 8-13).

16. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that virtual addresses increase the number of address locations the system is able to reference, thereby increasing the address space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the virtual addresses of Abramson in the device of Popescu to increase the address space.

17. Claims 10-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,606,670 (herein referred to as Abramson) in view Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,487,156 (herein referred to as Popescu).

Art Unit: 2183

18. Referring to claim 10, Abramson has taught an apparatus for forwarding storehit data within stages of a pipelined microprocessor, the apparatus comprising:

- a. A data unit, configured to forward a second plurality of store instruction results (Abramson column 2, lines 36-43; columns 4-5, lines 56-7; and column 6, lines 50-58); and
- b. Selection logic, coupled to said RFC and said data unit, for selectively providing one of said first and second plurality of store instruction results to a stage of the microprocessor pipeline executing a load instruction (Abramson column 2, line 49 to column 3, lines 3).

19. Abramson has not taught a result forwarding cache (RFC), configured to forward at least one non-store instruction result, and to forward a first plurality of store instruction results.

However, Abramson has taught that the system is an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21). Popescu has taught an out-of-order system with a result forwarding cache (RFC), configured to forward at least one non-store instruction result, and to forward a first plurality of store instruction results (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9; column 6, lines 38-49; Figure 1; and Figure 5). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as supported in Popescu, would have recognized that the RFC reduces stalls in a pipeline, thereby improving processor performance and efficiency (Popescu column 2, lines 47-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the RFC of Popescu in the device of Abramson to increase processor performance and efficiency.

20. Referring to claim 11, Abramson has taught wherein said load instruction comprises a load address for specifying an address of data to be loaded into the microprocessor, wherein said selection logic is configured to forward one of said first and second plurality of store instruction results only if said load address matches one or more of a first and second plurality of store addresses corresponding to said first and second plurality of store instruction results (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3 and columns 4-5, lines 56-7).

21. Referring to claim 12, Abramson has taught wherein selection logic forwards said first plurality of store instruction results forwarded by said RFC at a higher priority than said second plurality of store instructions results forwarded by said data unit if said load address matches both one or more of said first plurality of store addresses and one or more of said second plurality of store addresses (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3).

22. Referring to claim 13, Abramson has taught further comprising comparison logic, coupled to said selection logic, for comparing said load address with said first and second plurality of store addresses to determine whether said load address matches one or more of said first and second plurality of store addresses (Abramson column 2, lines 49-66).

23. Referring to claim 14, Abramson has taught wherein said data unit is configured to forward said second plurality of store instruction results from a plurality of store buffers of the microprocessor (Abramson columns 5-6, lines 66-6 and column 6, lines 50-58).

24. Referring to claim 15, Abramson has taught wherein said plurality of store buffers is configured to store said second plurality of store instruction results while said second plurality of store instruction results are written to a memory coupled to the microprocessor (Abramson column 3, lines 53-56 and columns 4-5, lines 56-7).



25. Referring to claim 16, Abramson has taught wherein said data unit is configured to forward a newest one of said second plurality of store instruction results if said load address matches more than one of said second plurality of store addresses (Abramson column 1, lines 53-61).

26. Referring to claim 17, Abramson has taught wherein said RFC is configured to forward a newest one of said first plurality of store instruction results if said load address matches more than one of said first plurality of store addresses (Abramson column 1, lines 53-61).

27. Referring to claim 18, Abramson has taught an apparatus for detecting storehit conditions in a pipelined microprocessor in a hierarchical manner, the apparatus comprising:

- a. First comparison logic, for comparing a load instruction load address in a first stage of the pipeline with a first plurality of store addresses of first store instruction data in a plurality of stages of the pipeline subsequent to said first pipeline stage (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-63);
- b. Second comparison logic, for comparing said load address with a second plurality of store addresses of second store instruction data in a plurality of store buffers of the microprocessor (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-63); and
- c. Control logic, coupled to said first and second comparison logic, configured to determine which of said first and second store instruction data is newest based on said first and second comparison logic comparing (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-63).

28. Abramson has not taught wherein said plurality of stages of the pipeline subsequent to said first pipeline stage do not comprise store buffers. However, Abramson has taught that the

Art Unit: 2183

system is an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21). Popescu has taught an out-of-order system wherein said plurality of stages of the pipeline subsequent to said first pipeline stage do not comprise store buffers (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9; column 6, lines 38-49; Figure 1; and Figure 5). In regards to Popescu, the instruction shelf compares addresses of both store and non-store instructions. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as supported in Popescu, would have recognized that the instruction shelves reduce stalls in a pipeline, thereby improving processor performance and efficiency (Popescu column 2, lines 47-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the instruction shelving of Popescu in the device of Abramson to increase processor performance and efficiency.

29. Referring to claim 19, Abramson has taught wherein said first comparison logic is configured to compare virtual addresses (Abramson column 1, lines 53-62 and column 3, lines 57-61).

30. Referring to claim 20, Abramson has taught wherein said second comparison logic is configured to compare physical addresses (Abramson column 1, lines 53-62 and column 5, lines 8-13).

31. Referring to claim 26, Abramson has taught a method for forwarding storehit data in a microprocessor pipeline, the method comprising:

- a. Detecting a storehit condition, wherein a load instruction in a stage of the pipeline specifies data generated by a previous store instruction, wherein said data is still present in the pipeline (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 36-3);

- b. Determining whether said data is present in said result forwarding cache (Abramson column 2, lines 36-43 and columns 4-5, lines 56-7);
- c. Selectively forwarding said data from said result forwarding cache to said stage if said data is in said result forwarding cache (Abramson column 2, lines 36-43 and columns 4-5, lines 56-7); and
- d. Selectively forwarding said data from a data unit of the microprocessor to said stage if said data is not in said result forwarding cache (Abramson column 2, lines 36-43; columns 4-5, lines 56-7; and column 6, lines 33-49).

32. Abramson has not taught storing at least one store instruction result and at least one non-store instruction result into a result forwarding cache of the microprocessor. However, Abramson has taught that the system is an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21). Popescu has taught an out-of-order system with storing at least one store instruction result and at least one non-store instruction result into a result forwarding cache of the microprocessor (Popescu column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 9; column 6, lines 38-49; Figure 1; and Figure 5). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as supported in Popescu, would have recognized that the forwarding cache reduces stalls in a pipeline, thereby improving processor performance and efficiency (Popescu column 2, lines 47-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the forwarding cache of Popescu in the device of Abramson to increase processor performance and efficiency.

Art Unit: 2183

33. Referring to claim 27, Abramson has taught storing results data of each store instruction executed by an execution unit of the microprocessor in said result forwarding cache (Abramson columns 4-5, lines 56-7).

34. Referring to claim 28, Abramson has taught wherein said detecting said storehit condition comprises:

- a. Comparing an address of said data specified by said load instruction with a plurality of store instruction result data addresses stored in the pipeline below said stage (Abramson column 2, lines 49-66); and
- b. Determining said address matches one or more of said plurality of data addresses (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3).

35. Referring to claim 29, Abramson has taught wherein said determining whether said data is present in said result forwarding cache comprises:

- a. Comparing an address of said data specified by said load instruction with a plurality of store instruction result data addresses stored in a predetermined number of stages of the pipeline below said stage (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3);
- b. Wherein said predetermined number equals a number of result entries in said result forwarding cache (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3; column 4, lines 22-30; and column 6, lines 59-62).

36. Claims 21-25, 30-31, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,606,670 (herein referred to as Abramson) in view of Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,487,156 (herein referred to as

Popescu) and in further view of Patterson and Hennessy's Computer Architecture A Quantitative Approach Second Edition © 1996 (herein referred to as Hennessy).

37. Referring to claim 21, Abramson has taught an apparatus for speculatively forwarding storehit data in a microprocessor pipeline, the apparatus comprising:

- a. A plurality of virtual address comparators, for comparing a virtual load address with a plurality of virtual store addresses to generate a virtual match signal (Abramson column 1, lines 53-62; columns 2-3, lines 49-63; column 3, lines 57-61; and columns 7-8, lines 49-6);
- b. A plurality of physical address comparators, for comparing a physical load address translated from said virtual load address with a plurality of physical store addresses translated from said plurality of virtual store addresses to generate a physical match signal (Abramson column 1, lines 53-62; columns 2-3, lines 49-63; column 5, lines 8-13; and columns 7-8, lines 49-6); and
- c. Control logic, for receiving said virtual and physical match signals and generating a stall signal for stalling the pipeline subsequent to said forwarding logic forwarding said storehit data if said physical match signal indicates a match between said physical load address and one of said plurality of physical store addresses but said virtual match signal indicates no match between said virtual load address and one of said plurality of virtual store addresses (Abramson column 1, lines 36-52; columns 2-3, lines 49-3; column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 10; and column 8, line 66 to column 9, line 43).

Art Unit: 2183

38. Abramson has not taught forwarding logic, coupled to receive said match signal for forwarding the storehit data in response to said match signal indicating no match between said load address and said plurality of store addresses, prior to generation of said physical match signal. However, Abramson has taught that the system is an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21). Popescu has taught an out-of-order system forwarding logic, coupled to receive said virtual match signal for forwarding the storehit data in response to said virtual match signal indicating no match between said virtual load address and said plurality of virtual store addresses, prior to generation of said physical match signal (Popescu column 8, line 29 to column 9, line 14 and Figure 5). In regards to Popescu, the instruction shelf compares addresses of store and non-store instructions. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as supported in Popescu, would have recognized that the instruction shelves reduce stalls in a pipeline, thereby improving processor performance and efficiency (Popescu column 2, lines 47-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the forwarding of Popescu in the device of Abramson to increase processor performance and efficiency.

39. In addition, Abramson has not taught generating a stall signal for stalling the pipeline. Hennessy has taught generating a stall signal for stalling the pipeline (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the stall of Hennessy would preserve the correct execution pattern when accessing slower memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the stall of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to ensure correct execution patterns.

Art Unit: 2183

40. Referring to claim 22, Abramson has taught the apparatus of claim 21, further comprising a data unit, configured to forward correct data specified by the load address to replace previously forwarded storehit data (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3). Abramson has not taught wherein said control logic is configured to deassert said stall signal after said data unit forwards said correct data. Hennessy has taught to deassert the stall signal (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the deassert signal of Hennessy would ensure the pipeline is not stalled longer than it needs to be stalled. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the deassert signal of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to increase speed.

41. Referring to claim 23, Abramson has taught a pipelined microprocessor for speculatively forwarding storehit data from a first pipeline stage to a second pipeline stage, wherein the storehit data is specified by a load address in the second stage, comprising:

- a. Address region logic, configured to receive the load address and generate a match signal to indicate whether the load address is within one of a plurality of non-cacheable address regions of the microprocessor address space stored therein (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3)
- b. Forwarding logic, for forwarding the storehit data from the first stage to the second stage prior to said address region logic generating said match signal (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3 and column 8, lines 43-49)

Art Unit: 2183

- c. Control logic, configured to receive said match signal, subsequent to said forwarding logic forwarding the storehit data (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3 and column 8, lines 43-49)

42. Abramson has not taught to assert a stall signal during a second clock cycle to stall the pipeline if said address region logic indicates the load address is within one of said plurality of non-cacheable address regions. Hennessy has taught generating a stall signal for stalling the pipeline (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the stall of Hennessy would preserve the correct execution pattern when accessing slower memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the stall of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to ensure correct execution patterns.

43. Referring to claim 24, Abramson has taught the microprocessor of claim 23, further comprising:

- a. A bus interface unit, for receiving data from a bus coupled to the microprocessor, said bus further coupled to a system memory and a plurality of peripheral devices (Abramson column 1, lines 53-56 and column 4, lines 11-21)
- b. At least one response buffer, operatively coupled to the second stage, for receiving load data specified by the load address from said bus interface unit, and for providing said load data to the second stage to replace the storehit data if the load address is within one of said plurality of non-cacheable address regions (Abramson column 1, lines 53-56; column 4, lines 11-21; and column 6, lines 33-58).



Art Unit: 2183

44. Referring to claim 25, Abramson has taught the microprocessor of claim 23, wherein said plurality of non-cacheable regions stored in said address region logic are software-programmable (Abramson column 6, lines 33-58). In regards to Abramson, it is inherent that the non-cacheable regions are software programmable since that is how data is written and changed.

45. Referring to claim 30, Abramson has taught a method for speculatively forwarding storehit data in a microprocessor pipeline, the method comprising:

- a. Determining that a virtual load address matches no virtual store addresses present in the pipeline (Abramson column 9, lines 21-43);
- b. Forwarding storehit data from a first stage to a second stage of the pipeline based on said determining that said virtual load address matches no virtual store addresses present in the pipeline (Abramson column 1, lines 53-62 and column 3, lines 57-1); and

46. Abramson has not taught detecting that a physical load address matches a physical store address present in the pipeline, subsequent to said forwarding said storehit data. However, Abramson has taught that the system is an out-of-order system (Abramson column 1, lines 19-21). Popescu has taught an out-of-order system detecting that a physical load address translated from said virtual load address matches a physical store address present in the pipeline, subsequent to said forwarding said storehit data (Popescu column 8, lines 29-36; Figure 1; and Figure 5). In regards to Popescu, the instruction shelf compares addresses of store and non-store instructions. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as supported in Popescu, would have recognized that the instruction shelves reduce stalls in a pipeline, thereby improving processor performance and efficiency (Popescu column 2, lines 47-

Art Unit: 2183

53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to incorporate the instruction shelf of Popescu in the device of Abramson to increase processor performance and efficiency.

47. In addition, Abramson has not taught stalling the pipeline in response to said detecting. Hennessy has taught stalling the pipeline in response to said detecting (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the stall of Hennessy would preserve the correct execution pattern when accessing slower memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the stall of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to ensure correct execution patterns.

48. Referring to claim 31, Abramson has taught the method of claim 30, further comprising forwarding correction data from a third stage of the pipeline to said second stage after said stalling the pipeline (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3). Abramson has not taught unstalling the pipeline after said forwarding said correction data. Hennessy has taught unstalling the pipeline after said forwarding said correction data. (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the unstage of Hennessy would ensure the pipeline it not stalled longer than it needs to be stalled. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the unstage of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to increase speed.

Art Unit: 2183

49. Referring to claim 33, Abramson has taught the method of claim 30, wherein said storehit data comprises a store instruction result within the pipeline having an identical physical store address as said physical load address (Abramson column 1, lines 36-39).

50. Referring to claim 34, Abramson has taught a method for speculatively forwarding storehit data in a microprocessor pipeline, the method comprising:

- a. Detecting a storehit condition by comparing a load address with a plurality of store addresses (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3)
- b. Forwarding storehit data in response to said detecting said storehit condition (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3 and columns 4-5, lines 56-7)
- c. Determining said load address is within a non-cacheable address region subsequent to said speculatively forwarding (Abramson columns 2-3, lines 49-3 and column 6, lines 36-49)

51. Abramson has not taught stalling the pipeline in response to said determining said load address is within a non-cacheable address region. Hennessy has taught stalling the pipeline in response to said determining said load address is within a non-cacheable address region (Hennessy Pages 139 and 153). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that incorporating the stall of Hennessy would preserve the correct execution pattern when accessing slower memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the stall of Hennessy in the device of Abramson to ensure correct execution patterns.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2183

52. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22, 24-31, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

53. Applicant's arguments for claims 23 and 34 filed 25 November 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

54. Referring to claim 23, the amendments made to the claim do not overcome prior art. Abramson states in column 8, lines 43-49 that the functions of the forwarding logic and control logic may be reversed, depending upon user and developer preference. Please see the rejection above.

55. Referring to claim 34, the amendment made to the claim did not overcome prior art. The distinctive meaning of speculative store forwarding remains unclear in the claim. Merely eliminating the word "speculatively" in the claim does not clarify the claim.

### ***Conclusion***

56. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made. Applicant must also show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

- a. Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,561,776, has taught out-of-order processing with instruction shelving.
- b. Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,625,837, has taught out-of-order processing with instruction shelving.

Art Unit: 2183

- c. Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,627,983, has taught out-of-order processing with instruction shelving.
- d. Popescu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,832,293, has taught out-of-order processing with instruction shelving.
- e. Popescu et al. "The Metaflow Architecture" IEEE Micro has taught out-of-order processing with instruction shelving.


57. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aimee J Li whose telephone number is (703) 305-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:30am-5:00pm.

58. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (703) 305-9712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

59. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Aimee J. Li  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2183

February 8, 2004

  
EDDIE CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100